

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Community Meeting On January 6, 2005 Southside Community Center

Community Members Present:

Ramsey Ajlouni, Rustom Ajlouni, Jim Apland, Adele Boydston, Bob Boydston, Nicole C., Barbara Camacho, Evan Camacho, R. Card, Joe Castillo, Gloria Chun Hoo, Adam Clark, Vicky Clark, Roger Costa, Frank Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Felicita de Jesus, Gail DeSmet, Roger Dettloff, Bob E., Laisyne Ekarer, Mark Ekarer, James Fan, Jack Faraone, Dennis Figueroa, Joseph Filice, Eric Flippo, Rod Foo, Art Gonzales, Reed Grandy, Bob Griesinger, Robert Grifall, Evelyn Guess, Jill Halloran, Janet Hebert, Kenneth Hoag, Virginia Holtz, Liz Hirata, Jon Jiesel, Peter Jensen, Shari Kaplan, Matt King, Jack Kuzia, Pat Kuzia, Pravin Lathigara, Vic LoBue, Parag Mehta, Chris Marchese, Eric Morley, Charlene Murray, Anne Nguyen, Thomas Nguyen, Dick Norman, Wayne O'Connell, Dennis O'Neal, Eddie Osako, Dan Perusina, Elizabeth Petrinovich, Troy Pham, Douglas Potter, Dan M., Peter Mandel, Maralee Potter, Ted Raczel, Dorine Ravizza, Mike Ravizza, Lillian Ruscitto, Paul Ruscitto, Annie Saso, Leo Sausedo, Kathleen Seebach, Vishakma Shah, Roger Sharp, Sonja Shurr, Peter Silva, Sharon Simonson, Bill Smith, Bob Snively, Sumiko Sorakubo, Virginia Taylor, Johnny Unck, Sharon Unck, Gerald Upshaw, Cecil Valez, J. Vanderpool, Jesse Votaw, Saul Wachter, Don Weden, David Wen, Steven Wen, Leland C. Wilcox, Lindsay Wolf, Barbara Woods, and Albert Yamauchi.

Task Force Members Present:

Eric Carruthers, Doreen Morgan and Ken Saso.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Jane Mark (SCC Parks), Dunia Noel (LAFCO), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Lloyd Wagstaff (The Nature Conservancy), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Councilmember Nancy Pyle, Ana Maria Rosato (Council District 10), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), and Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

Consultants:

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Jim Musbach (Economic & Planning Systems), Darin Smith (Economic & Planning Systems), James Edison (Economic & Planning Systems), Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers), and Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies).

1. Welcome:

The meeting convened at 6:30 p.m. with Eileen Goodwin, of Apex Strategies, welcoming everyone in attendance to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) community meeting.

2. Introductions and Agenda Overview:

Eileen indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to give an update of the conceptual land use plan and design concepts. She explained that her role is to serve as a meeting facilitator. Eileen asked how many people have never attended a CVSP meeting. A show of hands indicated that about 20 people have never done so. She also asked how the attendees heard about the community meeting. A show of hands indicated that approximately 40 people were informed by the CVSP postcard invitation, about 30 through the media, approximately 15 by the *Coyote Valley Vision* newsletter and about 10 by e-mail.

Eileen explained the agenda and introduced Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department. Laurel reviewed the meeting's agenda packet and mentioned that all materials are also available on the CVSP website. She indicated that public outreach and participation is important to the CVSP process and urged attendees to provide feedback about the meeting by filling out a comment card. Laurel described the background of the CVSP, explained the Process Diagram and provided an update of the Plan.

3. Conceptual Land Use Plan:

Ken Kay, of KenKay Associates, indicated that the Environmental Footprint identifies fixed and proposed elements that could solve technical problems and bring aesthetic character to the area over time. Doug Dahlin, with the Dahlin Group, presented the Composite Framework and explained the changes made between the old and new Framework.

Doug and Ken presented the modified public realm. Ken defined the public realm as a collection of elements that people share, such as public streets, parks and schools. The purpose of the framework is to establish a consistent vision for the Coyote Valley, give the region character and quality, and meet population growth demands. Doug explained that mathematical calculations were used to determine the number and types of public infrastructure needed based on the size of the population. He indicated that there would be seven elementary schools, two middle schools, and one or two high schools.

Eileen asked for questions and comments, and received the following from the audience:

- When will development begin? *Laurel explained that the City Council would consider adopting the CVSP in March 2006. Afterwards, LAFCO must annex Mid-Coyote into the City. Development in Mid-Coyote may begin in 2007 or 2008. However, development in North Coyote may be sooner since there are existing approvals.*
- Recommend developing in North San Jose where there is existing infrastructure. *Laurel explained that the City must plan to accommodate future growth.*
- How would the Plan be financed? *Jim Musbach explained that a comprehensive financing plan for public development is included in the CVSP. Private development would be funded through private finance.*
- Recommend putting together a partnership of investors.
- Which school district would have jurisdiction? *Eileen indicated that the Morgan Hill School District (MHUSD) has jurisdiction.*
- Recommend smaller student enrollment sizes for elementary schools. *Doug said that there would be about 600 students at each of the seven elementary schools.*
- Recommend that the high schools be located as far apart as possible.
- Concern about the shared use of school playfields. *Ken explained that there would be a fence separating school playfields from public recreational areas.*
- Concern that there would be too much public access to schools.
- Will there be a community college? *Doug said that they have been meeting with Gavilan College. He recommended that public facilities, such as a community college, incorporate urban design concepts.*
- Question about the location of police and fire stations. *Doug indicated that there would be three fire station locations. A community police station would be located in the core area.*
- Question regarding the reconfiguration of Santa Teresa Boulevard. *Doug explained that Santa Teresa Boulevard would be reconfigured to be more urban. Eileen said that the speed would be*

- reduced as a result.*
- Question regarding bike paths. *Ken said that there would be about 21 miles of bike paths. The bike paths would be along streets and along the Coyote Creek corridor. There would also be safe routes for children to get to school. Jim Thompson indicated there would be Class 1 bike trails on the Parkway.*
- Concern that the Parkway goes through their property. *Jim Musbach, with Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), explained that property owners would be financially compensated for land dedication through a fair-share system of compensation.*
- Question whether a property located on Willow Springs Road between Hale Avenue and Dougherty Avenue would be in the Greenbelt. *Doug replied in the negative.*
- Recommend using easements to prevent development close to Coyote Creek Park.
- Comment that the water table is only 2 feet in some areas and water will not filtrate lower than 20 feet because of the hardpan soil conditions.
- Concern regarding storm water runoff in a recreational lake. Recommend using biofiltration. *Doug indicated that most of the biofiltration would occur laterally. Jim Thompson, with HMM Engineers, explained that the canal would go through linear bio-filtration. He also indicated that groundwater recharge is planned. The lake will have an operations and maintenance plan which will be developed later.*
- Concern regarding the bottom of the lake since it is below the water table. *Jim Thompson explained that the lake would have a lining system to prevent groundwater intrusion. He indicated that they have technical and geotechnical groundwater maps based on each season. Eileen indicated that additional technical data is available on the CVSP website.*

4. Design Concepts:

Ken reviewed the history of planning in the United States and how the CVSP incorporates New Urbanism, the Ahwahnee and Smart Growth principles. Ken also discussed the elements of creating successful neighborhoods. Doug explained sustainable building practices and land use issues.

Doug and Ken described the various land uses for planning areas A through M. Doug discussed the possibility of residential build-out and how agricultural trust uses could make agriculture more viable.

Eileen asked for questions and comments, and received the following from the audience:

General:

- Concern that there was not sufficient time to look over the meeting's materials. Recommend advance notification of discussion topics.
- How will the Plan be implemented? *Laurel explained that the Plan is only good if it is realistic and financially feasible. She indicated that the City Council wants to see the Plan through completion.*

- Indication that there is no short- or medium-term need to develop campus infrastructure in Coyote Valley. Recommend the redevelopment of existing vacant properties, which would be cheaper to develop than to build new infrastructure in Coyote Valley. *Doug explained how the CVSP would address the City's job/housing imbalance.*
- Does the Plan need to go forward? *A raise of hands indicated that half of the attendees were in favor of the Plan, whereas the other half was against it.*
- Indication that there has been talk about developing Coyote Valley for a long time and that it is time for the CVSP to move forward.
- Concern that the Plan still contributes to sprawl.
- Indication that people still rely on cars. Concern that if the Plan discourages parking, where would the cars and parking go? *Doug explained that there would be a lot of structured parking and an adequate circulation system for cars. The plan will encourage transit and pedestrian use. The public transit will be fun, free and convenient, thereby encouraging people to use it.*
- Would there be handicapped parking? *Doug answered in the affirmative and explained that it is required by law.*
- Recommend that development east of Monterey Highway be located farther away from Coyote Creek corridor.
- How would public infrastructure be financed? *Doug indicated that \$1 billion would be needed for public development, open space, etc.*
- Are financial costs subject to a vote by ballot? *Jim Musbach indicated that property owners would vote to determine whether assessment districts would be established.*
- How would property owners be compensated for public land dedication? *Doug explained that cost allocations would depend on the type of land use and that there would be a fairshare compensation for those who dedicate public land.*
- When would compensation take place? *Jim Thompson indicated that it would be discussed in spring.*
- Recommend that the financing plan be more realistic and feasible. *Eileen stated that financing would be discussed in greater detail at the next Task Force meeting on Monday, January 10, 2005.*
- Indication that changes in the Plan would affect real estate values in terms of loans and financing. Concern that there are legal consequences since this information is available on the CVSP website.
- When will housing be discussed? *Eileen indicated that housing would be discussed in spring.*
- How would the 20% affordable housing requirement be dispersed? *Doug indicated that their goal is to disperse affordable housing throughout North and Mid-Coyote.*
- Recommend dispersing low-income housing throughout the plan so low income students are not concentrated at one high school.
- Would the Anderson Dam fail in the event of a large earthquake? *Jim Thompson indicated that the Anderson Dam is maintained and operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), and is regulated by the Division of Dam Safety. He explained that the main floodway is down Coyote Creek*

Planning Areas A and B:

- Are corporations interested in Coyote Valley?
- What will happen to currently vacant facilities in San Jose? *Doug explained that the vacant buildings might be redeveloped for other uses. The Plan would allow for some larger campus-style offices as well as mid-rise offices in Coyote Valley.*
- Concern that 50,000 jobs would put pressure on Morgan Hill and Gilroy to build more residences. Indication that there are other locations in San Jose for development. *Laurel explained that the Coyote Valley is a part of San Jose and that the City has been the bedroom community for the region. She said that the City has the housing capacity to support job growth in many areas of the city to provide a wide variety of choices for industry.*
- What is the maximum height for high rises? *Doug explained that there would be a 1:1 floor area ratio of building area to land area. This ratio is accomplished through eight story buildings in some areas.*

Planning Areas F, G and H:

- Are the properties on the Santa Cruz Mountains privately owned? *Doug answered in the affirmative and indicated that there may be easements for trails.*
- Suggestion that the distance between the Metcalf Power Plant and school be greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ miles.
- Concern regarding the light pollution from the high school's ball fields. *Doug indicated that there would be orchards that would act as 200-foot buffers around the ball field near the Greenbelt.*

Planning Areas I, J, K and L:

- Why is an elementary school located in planning area L? *Doug explained that it was located in planning area L because of it would allow accessibility for Greenbelt residents. He indicated that the school would not be built where there is an existing home.*
- Indication that easements along Scheller Avenue and Lantz Drive are privately owned by the water district.
- Indication that there is a private road from Lantz Drive to north of Scheller Avenue. How would the owner be compensated? *Jim Musbach indicated that those details would be addressed later.*

Planning Area M:

- Recommend that there be more definite plans for the Greenbelt.
- Would the Greenbelt have urban service? *Eileen answered in the negative and explained that there would not be any urban services south of Palm Avenue.*
- Why is the Greenbelt included in the Plan when it would not be annexed to the City? *Laurel said that the South Coyote Greenbelt is in the City's sphere of influence. The State requires that the City have policy level planning for all land, including those in its sphere of influence.*
- Indication that some parcels in the Greenbelt currently have agricultural uses. *Jim Musbach indicated that property owners with existing agricultural uses are encouraged to remain and there is no requirement that new uses include agriculture. Agricultural trust uses are meant to facilitate agriculture viability.*

- Support for an equestrian facility.

5. Adjourn:

Laurel thanked the attendees for their comments and participation in the community meeting. She indicated those without Internet access to contact the staff to obtain any CVSP information. Laurel invited everyone to attend the next Task Force meeting on Monday, January 10, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:25 p.m.